COMMISSIONERS
MARC SPITZER - Chairman
WILLIAM A. MUNDELL
JEFF HATCH-MILLER
MIKE GLEASON
KRISTIN K. MAYES





ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

2003 DEC 30 P 12-40

DATE:

DECEMBER 30, 2003

ALL CORP COMMISS DOCUMENT CONTROL

DOCKET NO:

T-03842A-03-0709

TO ALL PARTIES:

Enclosed please find the recommendation of Administrative Law Judge Amanda Pope. The recommendation has been filed in the form of an Order on:

ADVANCED TELCOM, INC. dba ADVANCED TELCOM GROUP (CC&N/RESELLER)

Pursuant to A.A.C. R14-3-110(B), you may file exceptions to the recommendation of the Administrative Law Judge by filing an original and ten (10) copies of the exceptions with the Commission's Docket Control at the address listed below by 4:00 p.m. on or before:

JANUARY 8, 2004

The enclosed is <u>NOT</u> an order of the Commission, but a recommendation of the Administrative Law Judge to the Commissioners. Consideration of this matter has <u>tentatively</u> been scheduled for the Commission's Working Session and Open Meeting to be held on:

JANUARY 13, 2004 and JANUARY 14, 2004

For more information, you may contact Docket Control at (602)542-3477 or the Hearing Division at (602)542-4250.

Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED

DEC 3 0 2003

BRIANC. MCNEIL

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

DOCKETED BY

1200 WEST WASHINGTON STREET; PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85007-2927 / 400 WEST CONGRESS STREET; TUCSON, ARIZONA 85701-1347

WWW.CC.State.az.us

This document is available in alternative formats by contacting Yvonne McFarlin, ADA Coordinator, voice phone number 602-542-3931, E-mail YMcFarlin@cc.state.az.us

1				
1	BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION			
2				
3	COMMISSIONERS			
4	MARC SPITZER WILLIAM A. MUNDELL			
5	JEFF HATCH-MILLER MIKE GLEASON			
6	KRISTIN K. MAYES			
7	IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF ADVANCED TELCOM, INC. DBA ADVANCED DOCKET NO. T-03842A-03-0709			
8	TELCOM GROUP FOR A CERTIFICATE OF CONVENIENCE AND NECESSITY TO PROVIDE DECISION NO			
	COMPETITIVE RESOLD INTEREXCHANGE			
9	TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICES, EXCEPT LOCAL EXCHANGE SERVICES. ORDER			
10	Open Meeting			
11	January 13 and 14, 2004			
12	Phoenix, Arizona			
13	1			
14				
15				
16				
17	1. On September 26, 2003, Advanced TelCom, Inc. dba Advanced TelCom Group			
18				
19	Convenience and Necessity ("Certificate") to provide competitive resold interexchange			
20	telecommunications services, except local exchange services, within the State of Arizona.			
21	2 Applicant is a switchless reseller that purchases telecommunications services from a			
22	variety of carriers for resale to its customers.			
23	3. In Decision No. 58926 (December 22, 1994), the Commission found that resold			
24	telecommunications providers ("resellers") are public service corporations subject to the jurisdiction			
25	of the Commission			
26	4. Advanced has authority to transact business in the State of Arizona.			
27	5. On December 5, 2003, Advanced filed an Affidavit of Publication indicating			
28	compliance with the Commission's notice requirements.			

- 6. On December 12, 2003, the Commission's Utilities Division Staff ("Staff") filed a Staff Report in this matter, which includes Staff's fair value rate base determination in this matter and recommends approval of the application subject to certain conditions.
- 7. In the Staff Report, Staff stated that Advanced provided financial statements for the six month period ending May 15, 2003, which list assets of \$14 million, total equity of \$6 million, and a net income of \$195 million.
- 8. In its Staff Report, Staff stated that based on information obtained from the Applicant, it has determined that Advanced's fair value rate base ("FVRB") is zero. Staff has determined that Applicant's FVRB is too small to be useful in a fair value analysis and is not useful in setting rates. Staff further stated that in general, rates for competitive services are not set according to rate of return regulation but are heavily influenced by the market. Staff recommended that the Commission not set rates for Advanced based on the fair value of its rate base.
- 9. Staff believes that Advanced has no market power and that the reasonableness of its rates will be evaluated in a market with numerous competitors. In light of the competitive market in which the Applicant will be providing its services, Staff believes that the rates in Applicant's proposed tariffs for its competitive services will be just and reasonable and recommends that the Commission approve them.
 - 10. Staff recommended approval of Advanced's application subject to the following:
 - (a) The Applicant should be ordered to comply with all Commission rules, orders, and other requirements relevant to the provision of intrastate telecommunications service;
 - (b) The Applicant should be ordered to maintain its accounts and records as required by the Commission;
 - (c) The Applicant should be ordered to file with the Commission all financial and other reports that the Commission may require, and in a form and at such times as the Commission may designate;
 - (d) The Applicant should be ordered to maintain on file with the Commission all current tariffs and rates, and any service standards that the Commission may require;
 - (e) The Applicant should be ordered to comply with the Commission's rules and modify its tariffs to conform to these rules if it is determined that there is a conflict

between the Applicant's tariffs and the Commission's rules;

- (f) The Applicant should be ordered to cooperate with Commission investigations, including but not limited to, customer complaints;
- (g) The Applicant should be ordered to participate in and contribute to a universal service fund, as required by the Commission;
- (h) The Applicant should be ordered to notify the Commission immediately upon changes to the Applicant's address or telephone number;
- (i) The Applicant's interexchange service offerings should be classified as competitive pursuant to A.A.C. R14-2-1108;
- (j) The Applicant's maximum rates should be the maximum rates proposed by the Applicant in its proposed tariffs. The minimum rates for the Applicant's competitive services should be the Applicant's total service long run incremental costs of providing those services as set forth in A.A.C. R14-2-1109; and
- (k) In the event that the Applicant states only one rate in its proposed tariff for a competitive service, the rate stated should be the effective (actual) price to be charged for the service as well as the service's maximum rate.
- 11. Staff further recommended that Advanced's Certificate should be conditioned upon the Applicant filing conforming tariffs in accordance with this Decision within 365 days of the effective date of this Decision, or 30 days prior to providing service, whichever comes first.
- 12. Based on Advanced's indication that it collects from its customers an advance, deposit, and/or prepayment, Staff also recommended the following:
 - (a) that Advanced's Certificate should be conditioned upon the Applicant procuring a performance bond as described below, and filing proof of that performance bond within 365 days from the date of an Order in this matter, or 30 days prior to providing service, whichever comes first;
 - (b) that Advanced be required to procure a performance bond in the initial amount of \$10,000, with the minimum bond amount of \$10,000 to be increased if at any time it would be insufficient to cover all advances, deposits, or prepayments collected from its customers, in the following manner: The bond amount should be increased in increments of \$5,000, with such increases to occur whenever the total amount of the advances, deposits, and prepayments reaches a level within \$1,000 under the actual bond amount; and
 - (c) that, if at some time in the future, Advanced does not collect from its customers any advances, prepayments or deposits, that Advanced should be allowed to file with the Commission a request for cancellation of its established performance bond. Staff stated that after Staff review of such filing, Staff would forward its

8

12

11

14

15

13

16

1718

19 20

2122

2324

26

25

27

28

recommendation on the matter to the Commission for a Decision.

- 13. Staff recommended that if the Applicant fails to meet the timeframes outlined in Findings of Fact Nos. 11 and 12, that Advanced's Certificate should become null and void without further Order of the Commission and that no time extensions for compliance should be granted.
 - 14. The rates proposed by this filing are for competitive services.
 - 15. Staff's recommendations as set forth herein are reasonable.
 - 16. Advanced's fair value rate base is zero.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

- 1. Applicant is a public service corporation within the meaning of Article XV of the Arizona Constitution and A.R.S. §§ 40-281 and 40-282.
- 2. The Commission has jurisdiction over Applicant and the subject matter of the application.
 - 3. Notice of the application was given in accordance with the law.
- 4. Applicant's provision of resold interexchange telecommunications services is in the public interest.
- 5. Applicant is a fit and proper entity to receive a Certificate as conditioned herein for providing competitive resold interexchange telecommunications services in Arizona.
- 6. Staff's recommendations in Findings of Fact Nos. 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 should be adopted.
- 7. Advanced's fair value rate base is not useful in determining just and reasonable rates for the competitive services it proposes to provide to Arizona customers.
- 8. Advanced's rates, as they appear in its proposed tariffs, are just and reasonable and should be approved.

ORDER

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the application of Advanced TelCom, Inc. dba Advanced TelCom Group for a Certificate of Convenience and Necessity for authority to provide competitive resold interexchange telecommunications services, except local exchange services, is hereby granted, conditioned upon its compliance with the conditions recommended by Staff as set

1	forth in Findings of Fact Nos. 10, 11 and 12 above.			
2	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Staff's recommendations set forth in Findings of Fact Nos			
3	8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 above are hereby adopted.			
4	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Advanced TelCom, Inc. dba Advanced TelCom Group			
5	shall comply with the adopted Staff recommendations as set forth in Findings of Fact Nos. 10, 11			
6	and 12 above.			
7	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that if Advanced TelCom, Inc. dba Advanced TelCom Group			
8	fails to meet the timeframes outlined in Findings of Fact Nos. 11 and 12 above, that the Certificate			
9	conditionally granted herein shall become null and void without further Order of the Commission.			
0	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this Decision shall become effective immediately.			
1	BY ORDER OF THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION.			
12				
13				
14	CHAIRMAN COMMISSIONER COMMISSIONER			
15				
16				
17	COMMISSIONER COMMISSIONER			
18	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I, BRIAN C. McNEIL, Executive			
19	Secretary of the Arizona Corporation Commission, have hereunto set my hand and caused the official seal of the			
20	Commission to be affixed at the Capitol, in the City of Phoenix, this, 2004.			
21				
22	BRIAN C. McNEIL			
23	EXECUTIVE SECRETARY			
24	DISSENT			
25				
26	DISSENTAP:mj			
27				
28				
	5 DECISION NO			

1	SERVICE LIST FOR:	ADVANCED TELCOM, INC.		
2	DOCKET NO.:	T-03842A-03-0709		
3				
4	Bobbi Ferguson Visiology, Inc.			
5	16061 Carmel Bay Drive Northpoint, Alabama 35475			
6	•	G1		
7	Christopher Kempley, Chief Counsel Legal Division ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION			
8	1200 West Washington Stree Phoenix, Arizona 85007			
9				
10	Ernest G. Johnson, Director Utilities Division ARIZONA CORPORATION	J COMMISSION		
11	1200 West Washington Stree			
12	Phoenix, Arizona 85007			
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				

DECISION NO.